

You Could Only Have a Tiny Piece of Your Own Peace
if You Were At Peace With the World

Written by Joshua Leonard

Jack L. Goldsmith and Eric A. Posner have a much more realistic perspective about the reality of international law in their book *The Limits of International Law* than that of Mary Ellen O'Connell in her book *The Power and Purpose of International Law*. International law is not as powerful as O'Connell made it out to be; it should not be powerful either. Not only is international law bound by real limits in the reality of our world, but it is the proper thing to have limits to international law. If I were given the choice, there would be no organization that would enforce international law. Because international politics can only deal with the reality of the situation, I have no choice but to accept the fact that international law does exist. Fortunately, international law only exists with a great many limitations that dwindle its effective power (Goldsmith and Posner, 225).

Every person naturally desires for the whole world to be at peace, but each person only wants peace on their own terms. The overall conception of peace is highly held by everyone. No individual is going to be happy without peace. This is why many individuals get together in an attempt to compel others to give to them that peace which they feel they deserve. Peace, like any other concept, is an easily misconstrued idea between the visualization of one individual and another. Everyone has their own idea of what their world should look like. They will only achieve

that peace of mind provided it is entirely in their own beliefs and self-interests. The only way to truly attain peace is by taking it away from another who wants peace in a different manner. It is this desire of every individual for the whole world to accept only your own idea of peace that will ensure that no one will ever find peace.

The meaning of peace can be defined in two different ways (Narin, uop.edu). There is peace that fully satisfies one individual's desire. Every individual is completely right in his own eyes, and that gives them a vain sense of peace. It is desired by every single individual to have that wholeness of peace which permits them to follow their own doctrine and opinions. The other kind of peace can be renamed piece. Peace between individuals does begin by first finding the common ground that matches in their beliefs and desires (Goldsmith and Posner, 27). However, it will be highly unlikely that two random people will have the exact same desires (Goldsmith and Posner, 34). Most often, the individual cannot attain everything he desires because of conflict with the contrary desires of others. The use of piece-peace partially satisfies a little of each person's desire into a compromise held by the group. Consenting that other people are entitled to their own opinions and actions can be a sensible compromise (O'Connell, 8). When an individual possesses a belief he believes is fundamentally sound, it would be best if he did not alter that belief or action just to satisfy the whims of others. There are many who liberally find peace in believing that people should compromise in different ways at different times to ensure that they

always get together (O'Connell, 10). There are many others who find peace in a more conservative manner by remaining consistent with their actions regardless of the random desires of others. Everyone is going to define their concept of peace for each issue by one definition or the other.

Peace, given either definition, can be taken as either good or bad, depending on the individual and the issue. The consenting individual believes it is wrong for the deviant individual to practice what he regards as right in his own eyes. The independent individual will quite naturally find it wrong to be compelled to act against his own ideas.

In the unfortunate reality, individuals are mandated by their state to comply with its terms of peace (O'Connell, 134-135). These terms are interpreted by those who rule. The rulers will make decisions based on what they believe is best to maintain peace. The country will likely represent what all its people generally believe (Goldsmith and Posner, 4). The state decides what its people are either free or obliged to do, whether or not it has a concern for their own ideals. It will have to either permit or forbid certain desires of its people. Its random ideals will most likely be both good and bad, yet everyone under his rule will inevitable have to abide by them (Goldsmith and Posner, 190). The people will generally find some common ground with the beliefs of their country, and they will at least attain a piece of their own peace. Just about every individual wishes to get their own way when they disagree with the state, yet they will unfortunately have no choice in the matter. Regardless of

whether or not the citizens of a state are satisfied, they are all governed to live by the one manner of peace of their state.

International law's alleged purpose is to maintain international peace (O'Connell, 136). In anyone's first thought, this cause appears to be wonderful. It is not as noble of a cause as you might think. It is hard enough for the citizens of a state, who generally have the same concept of culture, beliefs, and freedoms, to forfeit some of their most cherished ideas so they could live in peace with one another. All foreigners outside of that state are going to be beholden to entirely different concepts of culture, beliefs, and freedoms. We consider many of their traditions to be intolerable to our fundamental beliefs, and they feel just as often the same about us. Either they have their way, we have our way, or there is a compromise. International law is written by international lawyers or scholars who think they know from their own concept of peace what is the best choice to agree on for international peace (Goldsmith and Posner, 83). The reality is that people from such diverse cultures are only going to accept a tiny piece of that peace. If the entire world were forced to live under one term of peace, then almost no one could ever hope to achieve that whole peace we each personally long for.

There are three groups of people in this world who have a concept about the nature of dogs. One group loves dogs, another group eats dogs, and the last group believes dogs are taboo. Each one of these groups believe they are absolutely right in their belief on this issue. We feel people from the Orient are horrible because they eat dogs. We think that

people from the Middle East are paranoid because they frown upon owning dogs. People from both the Orient and the Middle East think we are crazy for worshiping dogs as pets. Currently, there is no such international law about dog rights or ownership. The radical dog-lovers of the West are not at peace because the dog-gourmets of the East are still eating dogs. Middle Easterners also consider it intolerable because, to them, it is wrong to eat unclean animals (Associated Press, nytimes.com). What if an international law was passed that appeased Middle Easterners by forbidding all human interaction with dogs? That would not set over too well with the dog lovers and eaters. What if an international law were to appease dog lovers by granting dogs the right to be pets and forbade eating them? Again, that would not set over too well with the rest of the world. What if there was a compromise? The answer is that no one would be completely happy (Goldsmith and Posner, 35). The three factions of the world will only be fully satisfied with their own concept about the nature of dogs.

The reality is that, unlike individuals belonging to a nation, each sovereign state is going to satisfy its own fulfillment of peace (Goldsmith and Posner, 109). It is fortunate for the citizens of a nation that they are not forced to comply with one contrary worldwide ideal of peace (Goldsmith and Posner, 188). The state might tell you how to live your life, but at least total strangers with strange ideas will have no say in our lives. Each state is going to protect its people from foreign ideas that would disturb its own unified peace.

International law is an ideal of peaceful interests held by a group of nations, which is not necessarily ideal to the interests held by another group of nations (Goldsmith and Posner, 28-34). Each nation has different interests, which are potentially better than those of an international consensus (O'Connell, 331). Nations are always going to act in their own interests, regardless of what foreign nations might think of them (Goldsmith and Posner, 170). The only true way to observe the situation between nations is to sensibly accept the reality of the situation. What nations feel like doing is ultimately going to be their action.

The Paquette Habana Case is a prime example of how nations only obey international law in their own self-interests (Goldsmith and Posner, 66-73). Many small countries observe this customary international law because it directly protects their self-interests. Many other countries only adhere to this policy if there is no conflict with their own self-interests. This could include those countries that are landlocked or those that do not have any interest in capturing foreign fishing vessels. The United States recognized the immunity of foreign fishing vessels during wartime. You might say we generally believe it is wrong to harm foreign civilians (Goldsmith and Posner, 192). We did this in our own self-interest because we wanted to look like the good guys in the international community (Goldsmith and Posner, 109-111). There are plenty of countries that do not try to hide behind a facade of innocence. They will attack foreign fishing vessels because they are either spoils of war or they are deemed a threat. Because many wars are started over such a small incident as the

sinking of a ship, nations will also discern whether or not it is worth provoking a war over. That is why nations sometimes do obey international law, but it is always in their own self-interests (Goldsmith and Posner, 185).

Treaties are an attempt by states to compel other states to make a compromise within their own peace (Goldsmith and Posner, 90). Because of the ambiguity of customary international law, a treaty binds states to adhere to the same terms (Goldsmith and Posner, 85). They are compelled to sign a treaty that might not necessarily reflect their own selfish desires, but the selfish desires of different states. If they do not sign the treaty, they are branded as the bad guys. If they do sign, they are supposedly bound to carry out the agreement even when it is against their will (Goldsmith and Posner, 191). Treaties can better satisfy one state's peace, yet it is only at the cost of removing part of another state's peace.

Sanctions are a failed attempt to force other countries to obey treaties. Sanctions are said to be force against other countries that is not applied in the wrong way, such as war (O'Connell, 96). Some countries think that their sanctions will annoy non-compliant countries enough to get them to consent to their way (O'Connell, 75). The reality is that sanctions have never worked (Mearshimer, youtube.com). Sanctions actually cause a reverse psychological effect that repels those sanctioned nations away from the countries imposing sanctions upon them. They develop an even stronger sense of nationalism and a desire for their own

terms of peace. Their economy never gets hurt by sanctions. If anything, the result of sanctions usually boosts that economy. Some international scholars want to theorize a world where sanctions work (O'Connell, 10). They do not work the way they were meant to.

I believe that the only way for a nation to protect all its own self-interests from the self-interests of other nations is through the use of war. When the peace of a state is threatened to the point that they do not want to make such a big compromise, war is a tool to contest for their whole peace (Goldsmith and Posner, 187). War is not necessarily bad. We know this because King Solomon said in Ecclesiastes chapter three that there is a time of war and a time of peace. People often have to fight for what is theirs and what they believe is right. Even the international community says war is justifiable for self-defense (O'Connell, 164) or preemptive action (O'Connell, 153-156) . Every country that ever went to war justifies war as the self-defense of their self-interests, which is what war is (O'Connell, 21-25). I believe there is no correct secular viewpoint to say which wars are bad and which ones are just. Treaties mean nothing if countries do not want to obey them (Goldsmith and Posner, 188), and sanctions have no influential effect. War is the one proven way a nation can act against another for its own self-interests.

Neoconservatives are Americans who want to use their military supremacy to enforce the self-interests of the United States government upon the rest of the world (O'Connell, 100-101). The same type of activists in other countries would be called imperialists. Their idea is that

the whole world should be a liberal democracy (Goldsmith and Posner, 205), whether they like it or not. They are psychopathic warmongers. They have no problem going to war with anyone who disagrees with them, provided they manage to justify their actions under the guise of international law (Goldsmith and Posner, 168). Disapproval of neoconservative actions is the one area in which I very much agree with O'Connell. It is not so much that I desire, like she does, for no particular nation to govern international interests, but as an American, it is not in my interests for America to police the world (O'Connell, 182-185). I do not want the neoconservatives to represent the policies of America. I want my isolationist ideals to shape the peace policy of our country. Nothing outside of the western hemisphere is going to possibly have any effect on us. I am more than convinced that America's idea of peace is no better than anyone else's. We cannot feel the horrible consequences of the actions we have taken overseas. We should have never taken upon us that vain responsibility to make the world a better place according to our hair-brained ideas.

The Iraq War is a heinous example of a neoconservative-led war. That whole ordeal started over that the Iraqi government refused to allow an international weapons inspector to inspect their weapons (O'Connell, 194). What if Iraq wanted to see our weapons? We would have never revealed our own confidential matters, yet we hypocritically expected them to do the same. A vicious, baseless rumor was spread that Iraq might have 'weapons of mass destruction'. America started a war

based on the excuse that they were potentially 'weapons of mass destruction'. We justified going to war with Iraq through the process of international law. Our soldiers went into Iraq. After ten years of fighting, they finally figured out that there were never any weapons of mass destruction (O'Connell, 146). The fact is that the neoconservative doctrine is a weapon of mass destruction. We committed the mass genocide of millions of Iraqi civilians. The American government claimed there were far fewer casualties, yet it was in our deceitful interest to flat-out lie.

It is not in most Americans' interests to fight other people's wars (Goldsmith and Posner, 217). Every foreign war that we have ever been in has only made the world worse, or at the very least not much better. Billions and billions of dollars are stolen from our pockets to fund wars. Countless lives of young men who could have progressed into constructive lives were snuffed out in their prime. At such a great cost, American citizens receive nothing in return that actually benefits their lives.

Neoconservative Americans falsely portray that America is always the 'good' guy in their battles against evil (Goldsmith and Posner, 202). I am quite certain that no country that fights America ever imagines itself as the villain. However, they might be sensible enough to comprehend that the enemy believes they are fighting for just as much of a noble cause as they are. Some Americans wisely recognize that their country commits war crimes just as frequently as the next country. If you refuse

to be indoctrinated by American war propaganda, then you are branded as a traitor or a fifth-columnist. The cause that America fights its wars for is not anymore just than anyone else's wars.

That little Spanish-American War we fought opened up a nasty can of worms, which continues to haunt us to this day (Goldsmith and Posner, 48-49). That war started over an unproven incident, and that war's cause was to make part of the world a better place (O'Connell, 156). Cuba might have never become communist if Spain, which won its civil war against communism, had still owned Cuba. We might have never suffered a devastating defeat to Japan when they conquered the Philippines. If we had not imperially annexed Hawaii during the same time period, we might have been able to stay out of World War II. The wars we begin never result in making the world better. We almost always make the world worse. All of these problems came about from one of America's more harmless wars.

I believe the world today would not be in any more of a mess if the outcome of World War II were different. It was a conquest between the three ideologies—fascism, liberalism, and communism (Deneen, 5)—to attain worldwide peace only on their terms. Ironically, Adolf Hitler did, in part, win that war. Like any other individual, all Hitler ever wanted was peace under his ideals (O'Connell, 162). His cause for a worldwide new order of peace soon came to fruition. The only difference was that the fascist ideology did not lead it. The bipolar world remained governed for a while between liberalism and communism (O'Connell, 334). Eventually,

the communists, by their own free will, came to the conclusion that communism was wrong. That was very big of them to admit that, and it was the right thing to end that ideology. The remaining unipolar ideology in the world is liberalism (Deneen, 5). Just because fascism and communism were wrong does not make liberalism right. They were all wrong, yet the liberal regime is not sensible enough to admit that. The world would be no different at all if either the fascists or communists became the one world order. Both of them have killed their innocent millions, and the liberals have slaughtered their millions as well, primarily through the scheme of the sexual revolution. Though almost no fascist or communist countries remain today, a very large portion of the world still holds contempt towards liberalism. That ideology will also hopefully cease to exist (Deneen, 192). The world today could not be any less peaceful, even if the fascists won World War II.

I believe it is none of our concern how other countries fight their wars. If another country, such as Japan, wanted to go on an imperialistic conquest, that is completely up to them, provided they do not attack us. It is not our place to say who is right and who is wrong. Our opinion is not going to be any better than that of the countries that are doing the actual fighting.

How can we know for sure what is the true terms of peace? Any conclusion about peace we arrive at from our own opinions is going to be non-fundamental without any sound reason why that idea is any better than another (Goldsmith and Posner, 195). The only way we could

possibly ever know is by reading the inerrant Bible. The Bible says in Psalms 119:165 Great peace have they which love thy law: and nothing shall offend them. True peace of mind can only be attained by believing and acting upon the principles of the Bible.

When the Biblical principles governing our lifestyles are infringed upon, then that is the time to go to war. We Christians should make our best effort to not falter in our beliefs. The world, with its faulty concept of peace, tries to peer pressure us into letting them have their own way (O'onnell, 266). It is wrong to give them a piece of our peace when God deserves our whole peace. If we are at peace with God, He will be gracious enough to fight our battles for us. Be aware! If we are forsaking the peace of God, then He will cause our enemies to persecute us. This brings up an important point. Not only is it good for us to win a war if we are in the right, but it is equally just as good for our benefit if we are defeated in war when we are in the wrong. The only truly just cause for war is when our own Christian lifestyle is attacked.

Israel is a well-used example in the Bible of a nation that is always at war. We know that it was alright for the Israelites to conquer the land of Canaan, which God permitted to belong to them. Similar to America or any other country, Israel is more often in the wrong than in the right. In fact, Israel is an example of just how much evil and wickedness God will put up with to keep His promise to a few upright men. Israel was given the advantage of having the law given to them, yet they time and time again chose to forsake the Lord. Unspeakable abominations such as idol

worship, fornication, and witchcraft have been openly flaunted during the longer portion of Israel's very long history. They are not God's 'holy' people as they are made out to be. He was about to destroy them all, except for Moses. Only for the sake of Moses, whom the Lord found favor with, did God change His mind. Time and time again, the people of Israel would forsake God, and God would hand them into the hands of their enemies. When the Israelites were ready to be at peace with God once again, then God would deliver them from the hands of their enemies. Israel was close to God pretty much just during the reigns of David and Solomon. Every single king of Samaria and most of the kings of Judah did evil in the sight of the Lord. Israel was seldom ever at peace with God. God often shown His overabundant mercy upon wicked Israel only for the sake's of David and Solomon. The Bible demonstrates how God uses war to keep Israel in the right.

No, the Bible does not say that we should support Israel. Many mistakenly believe that God's promise to Abraham in Genesis 12 tells us to bless Israel if we want to be blessed (Braatelian, thegatewaypundit.com). The Bible states, "I will bless them that bless thee." The word 'thee' is the singular form of the word you. God did not use the plural 'ye'. God is talking to Abraham. Whoever blesses Abraham (thee) will be blessed. For one thing, the modern Israel today is a fake (Corey, benjaminlcorey.com). It does not consist of the children of Abraham. It is made up of white-skinned Germans and Americans who claim to be Jewish. Both now and in the ancient past, Israel's worst sins

are pride and iniquity. Iniquity is when men falsely believe they are doing the right thing when they sin. Vile, wicked Israel pridefully believes that they are so good. The pharisees in Jesus' time believed they were prideful because they did appear to be blameless. Paul believed he was doing the right thing when he martyred Christians. Modern-day Zionists are the most iniquitable people in the entire world. Such wicked Jews do not worship God. Zionists worship their nation and themselves. Unlike the Pharisees, modern-day Jews are not even close to appearing blameless. Tel Aviv is known as the gay capital of the world. Military conscription is mandatory for all men and women alike. The Bible indicates that men should not be drafted if they just got married, started a business, or are cowards. I equivocate that the drafting of women is as bad as murder. They do not believe that Jesus is God. The Father is not with them because they denied the Son. They instead believe that they are gods, and they expect the rest of the world to worship them (Menahan, infowars.com). In regard to the recent Israel-Gaza debacle, that is nothing new (Goldsmith and Posner, 211). They have been almost constantly fighting each other since the days of David and Goliath. The brief moments that are news are when Israel is not fighting. I could care less if Israel and the Middle Eastern countries blow themselves up into oblivion. Both sides hate God and God's peace. America should not give aid to Israel, first of all, because it is not in our interests. It is not in God's interests either. It is iniquity to donate money to the wicked millionaires who live in Israel. God is not going to bless us for blessing them who curse Jesus Christ.

Blessed is the nation whose God is the LORD. This is what King David has told us in the Psalms. Most modern Jews are not the children of Abraham. We, who are Christians, are the adopted children of Abraham. If a nation adheres to the Bible and seeks after God, that nation will be blessed. We will find oneness with God in His peace.

If it were possible for every individual to be at peace with God, only then could the whole world be in the one true peace (O'Connell, 132). The Bible is the only correct international law book there is. The current misconception of international law is that of men who are pretending to be gods. Only God can righteously govern between nations. Because of the sinful nature of every individual, we fail to be completely at peace with God (Goldsmith and Posner, 224). We cannot force anyone in foreign countries to be at peace with God, and most of them are going to reject God. The reality is that there can be no world peace because the world is not at peace with God. It will not be until the Millennium that God will rule the entire world under one peace. Even then, many people who are not at one with God in their own hearts will be compelled to do the right thing. They will still only have a piece of their peace. When Christians get to Heaven, only then will we be in one wholeness of peace within our hearts.

Man's attempt at international law is unrealistic and unethical (Goldsmith and Posner, 226). If international law does not correlate with the Bible, then we already know it is wrong. It is fortunate that there is no human way to force the whole world to live under one peace. Each

culture could only enjoy a very small piece of their peace. The whole world hates God and everyone who is at peace with Him. It will always be in the heathens motives to not allow Christians to have any peace at all. Christians have no way of making everyone in the whole world to be at peace with God all at the same time (Goldsmith and Posner, 224). We could at the most make peace with God in the country we live in (O'Connell, 330). Everything that immediately surrounds our own lives is what we are going to have to deal with. We do not have to worry about the Chinese on the other side of the world persecuting us unless we live in China. We only have to make sure that the country that defines our peace does not persecute us. Only Christians can manage to keep their whole peace if they keep close to God. If this world were to agree to live under one peace, each individual could only enjoy a tiny piece of their peace.

Bibliography

The Holy Bible, Authorized King James Version

Goldsmith, Jack L. and Posner, Eric A. *The Limits of International Law*.
Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 2005.

O'Connell, Mary Ellen. *The Power and Purpose of International Law*.
Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 2008.

Deneen, Patrick J. *Why Liberalism Failed*. Yale University Press, 2019.

Narin. *Concept of Peace*. University of Peshawar, Pakistan,

www.uop.edu.pk/ocontents/concept%20of%20peace.pdf, 2012

The Associated Press. "World Briefing | Middle East: Saudi Arabia: Not Dog People, or Cat People Either (Published 2006)." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 9 Sept. 2006, www.nytimes.com/2006/09/09/world/world-briefing-middle-east-saudi-arabia-not-dog-people-or-cat-people.html.

Mearshimer, John. "Do Economic Sanctions on Russia Work?" *Youtube*, 14 Mar. 2022, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lfCoSfuYq9A>

Corey, Benjamin L. "No, the Bible Doesn't Command We 'Stand with Israel.'" *Benjamin L. Corey*, 4 Feb. 2020, www.benjaminlcorey.com/no-bible-doesnt-command-stand-israel/.

Braatelian, Ole. "Mike Johnson Reveals His Favorite Passage in the Bible, Torches Media Attacks on Christianity." *The Gateway Pundit*, 24 Nov. 2023, www.thegatewaypundit.com/2023/11/mike-johnson-reveals-favorite-passage-bible-torches-media/.

Menahan, Chris. "Israeli Rabbi to Christians: 'You Shouldn't be Worshipping One Jew, You Should be Worshipping All of Us'" *Infowars*, 10 Oct. 2023, www.infowars.com/posts/israeli-rabbi-to-christians-you-shouldnt-be-worshipping-one-jew-you-should-be-worshipping-all-of-us/.